DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 151 CG 011 428

AUTHOR Heyneman, Stephen P.; Daniels, William
TITLE Adolescent Research Opinion and National Youth Policy: What We Know and What We Don't Know.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT DHEW-105-76-1120
NOTE 82p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescence; Federal Government; Futures (of Society); *Government Role; Institutional Role; *Policy Formation; Public Policy; *Research Needs; Research Projects; Responsibility; *School Role; Workshops; *Youth

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes and interprets a workshop which focuses on youth research--where it is intellectually, what it has learned over the past decade, and where it is going. In addition, practical suggestions for appropriate roles which government could play in youth research, other than simply to supply more funds, are discussed. From over 60 issues raised in the workshop, four themes are identified and developed: (1) rights and privileges versus obligations and responsibilities; (2) school role; (3) "normal" youth; and (4) the relationship of the adolescence research community to the various branches of government. (Author/JLL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140151

Adolescence Research Opinion and National Youth Policy:

What We Know and What We Don't Know

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Stephen P. Heyneman
Social Research Group
The George Washington University

William Daniels
Office of the Assistant Secretary for
Planning and Evaluation, DHEW

CG 011428

The discussion at this Workshop was considerably enhanced by the participation of a few particularly sensitive government officials. They were as follows: from the Office of Youth Development, Carolyn Dean and Catherine V. Richards; from the National Institute of Education, Lois-ellin Datta; from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, James Howell; from the National Institute of Mental Health, Ira Lourie; and from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, William Prosser.

ADOLESCENCE RESEARCH OPINION AND NATIONAL YOUTH POLICY: WHAT WE KNOW AND WHAT WE DON'T KNOW

Stephen P. Heyneman
Social Research Group
The George Washington University

William Daniels
Office of the Assistant Secretary for
Planning and Evaluation, DHEW

Fall 1976

The work upon which this publication is based was performed under the auspicies of the Office of the Secretary, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, and supported in part by DHEW Contract #105-76-1120.

SCHOLAR-PARTICIPANTS IN THE WORKSHOP ON YOUTH RESEARCH

March 8th and 9th, 1976

Floyd Dennis, Director
Institute on Youth and Social Development
J.F. Kennedy Center for Research on
Education and Human Development
The George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 327-8296

Dorothy H. Eichorn
Associate Director
Institute for Human Development
1203 Tolman Hall
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94702
(415) 642-5825

Ronald A. Feldman, Director
The Boys Town Center for the Study of
Youth Development
11414 West Center Road, Suite 210
Omaha, Nebraska 68144
(402) 334-9500

Robert Grinder
Office of the Dean
College of Education
Arizona State Unviersity
Tempe, Arizona 85281
(602) 965-3306

Albert H. Hastorf, Director
Boys Town Center for the Study of
Youth Development
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305
(415) 497-1706 or 497-3733

John P. Hill, Chairman
Department of Human Development
and Family Studies
Martha Van Rensselaer Hall
Corpell University
Ithaca, New York 14853
(607) 256-7620

Richard Jessor
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80309
(303) 492-6921

Gisela Konopka, Director and
Professor and
Michael Baizerman, Associate Professor
Center for Youth Development and
Research
School of Public Health
325 Haecker Hall
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 376-7624

James P. O'Connor, Director
Boys Town Center for the Study of
Youth Development
Catholic University
Washington, D.C. 20064
(301) 635-5999

Daniel Offer, Co-Chairman
Department of Psychiatry
Michael Reese Hospital & Medical
Center
2959 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60616
(319) 791-3826

Anne Seiden, Director of Research
(312) 341-6363 and
Gary Schwartz, Senior Research Associate
(312) 341-8172
Institute for Juvenile Research
1140 South Paulina Street
Chicago, Illinois 60612

Shiela G. Sheinberg
Deputy Director of Child-Youth Services
College of Social Sciences
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004
(713) 749-4976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Workshop	1
The Report's Intentions	3
SESSION I: Rights and Privileges Vs. Responsibilities and Obligations	5
Privileges and Responsibilities	6
A Notion of Community	7
Ideas for Policy: On Whom Do You Rely?	8
Which Rights, Which Obligations, and When?	9
Criteria for Allocating Responsibility: By Age or by Competency?	10
SESSION II: The Role of the School	13
The School as an Institution: Unfairly Maligned?	14
SESSION III: Normal Adolescence	19
How Kids Learn Behavior	20
The Dividing Line Between Normal and Deviant Behavior	21
Adolescence Development: A Process of Stages?	22
Divergent Concepts: Youth and Adolescence	24
Popular Myths Concerning Adolescence	25
Problems in Adolescence Which Are Normal	26
SESSION IV: The Relationship of the Adolescence Research Community to the Various Branches of Government	29
The Lack of Adolescence Research Representation	30
Objections to an Adolescence Research Organization	32

Page

SESSION V: Summary Session: The Future Role of the Federal Government 35

Youth Policy 36

Specific Suggestions: Government Centers for Dissemination and Improving Funding Procedures 39

Responsibilities of the Research Community 42

Adolescence Research Opinion and National Youth Policy: What We Know and What We Don't Know 45

With Respect to Rights and Privileges Vs. Obligations and Responsibilities 45

With Respect to Normal Adolescence 46

With Respect to the Influence of the School 47

With Respect to Youth Policy and the Role of the Federal Government 48

Final Notes 49

1. Who Comes Under a Youth Policy: Conflicting Criteria for Defining Adulthood 49

2. Proactive Research 50

3. A Research Agenda for the Future 52

Themes for a Research Agenda 53

1. Which Rights, Which Obligations, and When 53

2. Notion of Community 54

APPENDIX: Summary of Points Raised in Each Session 57

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Workshop

A planning initiative is currently underway in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (OASPE), to define a long-range role for youth. It is within this context that OASPE sponsored a two day conference entitled "The Workshop on Youth Research." Its purpose was to obtain a first hand, accurate, and representative feeling about where youth research was intellectually, what it had learned over the past decade, and where it was going. In addition, the office was interested in receiving practical suggestions for appropriate roles which government could play in youth research, other than to simply supply more funds. Specifically, the office is soliciting ideas for coordinating and developing a "research agenda" for youth. It is hoped that eventually this research agenda may provide the necessary background information to develop a legislative program for a National Youth Policy.

Workshop participants were selected primarily from university-affiliated institutes conducting adolescence research. Invitations were sent to the respective directors. Prior to the workshop, participants provided a brief description of their institute, and a brief abstract of past and current research efforts. Lastly, they were asked to respond to three preworkshop questions: What did they feel were the two or three most critical issues affecting youth research (other than lack of funds); the most important research questions pertaining to their institutes; and, from

their perspective, what the focus of a research agenda for the Federal government might be.

Over 60 issues were raised. These included moral development, ego development, youth culture, learning opportunities (educational and developmental), the definition of "youth," social development, socio-emotional changes in and around puberty, coordination of research, dysfunctional fragmentation of social science knowledge, (poorly) applied versus basic research, and crisis-oriented research, to name only a few.

From these diverse issues, four themes were identified: (1) rights and privileges versus obligations and responsibilities; (2) the role of the school; (3) "normal" youth; and (4) the relationship of the adolescence research community to the various branches of government. A question which reflected a wide diversity of concerns and perspectives was developed for each theme and later presented to the participants for their reactions.

The 14 participants who came to the workshop represented some of the most eminent adolescent research institutions in the United States. From the participants we, as organizers, had three expectations. It was made clear before the conference began that we wished to elicit the following:

1. their responses with respect to problems affecting youth rather than youth with specific problems;
2. a wide variety of research opinion on where youth research should go over the next decade;
3. their responses to the following question: "Other than providing an increased level of funding, what role should the Federal government play in the sponsorship of youth research?"

The workshop was divided into five hour-and-a-half discussion sessions. Participants were asked to respond verbally to four written questions, with one session spent on each topic. They had not seen the questions beforehand, nor had they previously prepared verbal statements of any kind. A fifth and concluding session, held without a written question, discussed the role of the Federal government in guiding youth policy. Thus what each of these five sessions required was simply honest and spontaneous reaction. These reactions were recorded on tape and were subsequently typed into raw manuscripts.

The Report's Intentions

This report has three intentions: First, it attempts to interpret and summarize the views of the participants. Second, it hopes to clarify specific issues on which there was agreement and disagreement. And lastly, it tries to separate these two categories of issues and to contemplate their implications for a policy on youth. This was no small undertaking, for each discussion evolved its own format. Some sessions were tightly organized. In others, dialogue was allowed to float freely over new issues or over past topics, depending upon the mood. Some sessions were marked by fatigue on the part of the participants; other sessions were characterized by genuine insight. This variance was normal, and was to be expected. But whichever form the discussion took, we have put together the opinions as we heard them, and have tried to present them and our conclusions simply and concisely.

SESSION I

Rights and Privileges Versus Responsibilities and Obligations

Question:

Since its inception, the study of adolescence has generated much reform in the areas of juvenile justice, school codes, and alternations of traditional pedagogy. Recently, however, a youth researcher has argued that nonadult populations should be denied the extension of identical rights and privileges which are held by adults. This scholar has said that: "The social movement in the United States that has as its praiseworthy objective to grant more power to powerless persons has been expanded without reason or logic to include dependent children."

Two questions might emerge from this statement. First, do dependent children deserve rights and privileges identical to those of adults, and if not, then using your own research experience concerning adolescent maturation, what should be the reasoning behind this denial?

Second, what responsibilities and obligations to the state or community would be appropriate to expect of youth in the next decade?

Privileges and Responsibilities

More than any other issue under discussion at this workshop, the subject of rights and privileges vs. responsibilities and obligations involves matters that are divorced from science and are encompassed in philosophy. Consequently, the discussion was expected to be political, and it was. But despite this fact, there was, to a large extent, a congruence of opinion on goals. Less conservative/liberal ideology was in evidence than might have been anticipated. And in our opinion, this is what ultimately made the discussion, and later the whole workshop both successful and pleasant.

There was at first some dismay expressed that the question of rights and privileges should be considered in conflict with obligations and responsibilities. Were they not identical, inextricable? Did one not follow logically and inevitably from the other? The first response to this query was that "yes," in normative terms the second ought to follow from the first, but that in empirical terms, in terms of what exists, the second often did not. As one participant put it: The balance between privileges and obligations is not always accepted, but furthermore, there are situations in which the two principles compete and where a decision has to be made as to whether a child should have one or the other is a given circumstance.

But the written question to which the workshop was to respond stated that equal rights and privileges had been extended to nonadults without "reason or logic." To this, one participant responded that clearly there has been both reason and logic for example behind the right to cross-examination in juvenile court hearings or the right to wear the hair length of one's choice to a public school. The reason and logic stem from the inalienable

rights of the U.S. Constitution, being applied for the first time to all citizens: minorities, females, and youths. But there were other sides expressed too. Said one participant: what about the rights of those who suffer at the hands of others? For example, what does "informed consent" mean to someone who cannot learn math because a kid out in the school hallway has a gun pointed at his head? Another participant said that society habitually asks that parents worry about their part of obligations and responsibilities; but is society sufficiently expecting youth to do likewise? A third said that when discussing what it means to have a healthy balance between the two principles, everyone's conception will be a private statement of one's political and social philosophy. The question that society must now face, he continued, is how far it can allow individuality to go without also requiring a balance of social responsibility; how can the benefits of freedom and creativity accruing from individuality be preserved, without also having its "attendant honor show."

The Notion of Community

There seemed to be agreement among the participants about the notion of community. To be a community, there had to be concurrence among community members on one or more basic assumptions about what "they all want." A family can be considered a community; a school can be considered a community; so can a neighborhood; and a nation. It was agreed that in all these contexts, a balance of both rights and obligations should be encouraged. Furthermore, said one participant, we should eliminate some common myths about our own society, for example, that Eastern bloc countries are more idealistic than we are. Indeed, we in this country have a unique ideological combination in our Constitution.

Ideas for Policy: On Whom do You Rely?

But beyond the fact that a community should seek a balance, there was considerable disagreement as to how, as to what was appropriate, and under what circumstances. Should a community rely upon consumer opinion, said one scholar, even if that opinion differed markedly from the experts? What if 88 percent of the parents believed "x" was right and 88 percent of the experts believed "y" was right?

Another participant told a humorous story which illustrated a similar point. It seems, she said, that there was this professor of entomology who specialized in termites. He would work day after day in his laboratory, rarely thinking of anything else, rarely meeting with people other than specialists with a similar interest. One evening, he was invited to a social occasion. The hostess of the party was particularly glad that despite his reputation for isolation, he had decided to accept. Finally, when there was an opportunity, she presented him with her problem. "You see professor," she said, "my house is being destroyed by termites! What should I do?" "Nothing," was the expert's reply, "you see I am on their side!"

The point was well taken. Experts who are dealing with youth have been known to slip from the role of scientist, to that of advocate. But furthermore, within the role of advocate it is possible to find champions who believe that their clients deserve to be victorious, and their enemies deserve to be vanquished, champions who see issues as essentially having but two sides "for kids or against kids." The implication seemed to be that such an adversary style of communication could only be unproductive, and in the final analysis had no legitimate place in the field of youth research.

Which Rights, Which Obligations, and When?

There were a number of points raised on the issue of which rights and what obligations, and when. If children are given rights, one participant said, the context of each of those rights needs to be specified. Another said that we must seek answers to three questions:

(1) What do we want our children to do?

(2) What kinds of lives do we want our children to lead?--and--

(3) What contributions do we want our children to make to society?

Responsibility was defined by one participant as "meeting the obligations of others." Then in response to a suggestion that adolescents should adhere to certain obligations, two complex issues were raised: One was that all appropriate behavior can be defined by a social and institutional context. For example, one participant pointed out that behavioral expectations for children at a given age can differ radically from one ethnic group to another. Then a somewhat ominous warning was raised by a second participant who suggested that whoever sponsors training for responsibility could place the sponsor in the position of exacerbating conflict. Nevertheless, those who sponsor the extension of rights or privileges for adolescents do not do so without dissent. For example, there were some parents who firmly believed that a certain length of hair should be expected of young people in public schools and the extension of freedom along that dimension was advanced only under conflicting pressures.

It did not take long before the issue of freedom and authority was defined as a basic dilemma. The dilemma, as one participant put it, was a question which we will all eventually be confronted with: how should we motivate adolescents? Should we give them experience and hope to influence them

by example, or should it be through social constraints? When should it be one, and when should it be the other? And why?

Criteria for Allocating Responsibility: By Age or by Competency?

The complexity of the motivation question was illustrated by the conflict of views between those who held that age categories were the most important criteria for deciding upon the allocation of responsibility and those who held that it was the development of competencies which should be the determining factor. The debate on this issue was lengthy, spilled over into the sessions on normal adolescence and on public policy, and elicited some of the most productive exchanges of the workshop.

It was generally accepted that individuals develop competencies at different rates. For example, some 16 year olds are definitely capable of driving responsibly while others are not. Thus it was an accepted fact that the development of competency was not linear; nor was the development of"interactions between competencies."

One suggestion was made that this whole question was a source for research and researchable issues. For example, at what stage should "informed consent" be granted? Or how can learning theory contribute to cooperation, without the intervention adversely affecting individuality.

We will summarize this discussion on the development of competencies and the application of social policy in a later section. Let us mention one issue here which went right to the heart of this session's political matter: does an increase in an adolescent's competence lead to the capacity for him or her to undertake additional responsibility; or does additional responsibility lead to an increment in an individual's measured competence?

This issue was not resolved; nor is it likely to be. It is a basic philosophic division, with origins perhaps in Rousseau and in Hobbes. But at least one individual was not bothered by its implications and held that agreement on this was not necessary for advancement in knowledge. Often times, she said, understanding can result from a dialectic of opinion, from contrasting approaches.

So the question had to be left for the moment. To decide whether to sponsor responsibility and so develop competence, or to develop competence and so develop the capacity for responsibility, the decision would have to remain until the precise environment could be specified, in other words, left for future research on adolescence.

SESSION II

The Role of the School

Question:

In the past a great emphasis has been placed upon the school as an institution; there have been numerous efforts to alter children's attitudes and life chances by investing time and effort during the time the child spends at school. Recently some scholars have expressed doubts about influencing adolescents through the classroom and its curriculum. How do you and your institute approach this question: How much effort would you place in the school? What do you perceive as institutional alternatives?

The School as an Institution: Unfairly Maligned?

The question posed on the influence of the school was the most specific of the workshop. It indirectly referred to issues of a certain literature symbolized by the Coleman and Jencks studies, and was asking for comment on a subject with a complex and particular methodology. Because of the wide range in specialities, at first the question seemed to confuse participants. Perhaps the term school "influence" was not uniformly recognized. Nevertheless, most had done primary research on school children, had frequently used the school as a setting for research, and had discussed the school in their publications. So it wasn't long before the question elicited exactly the kind of dialogue that was hoped for, with the session finally producing more than its share of valuable insights.

Though not stated directly, there appeared to be a general feeling that the school as an institution had been subjected recently to an abundance of criticism, often unwarranted. It is true that schools have been commonly held responsible over the course of the last decade for not equalizing opportunity, for not preparing kids for work, for "overeducating," for not transferring basic skills as well as they once did, for not getting kids interested in learning and therefore preventing them from dropping out, and for not eliminating discrimination and unequal career patterns among races and social classes. For these and other reasons, it has been popular to say: it is the school's fault, and if schools were different the problem would be resolved.

The historiography of this point of view was never mentioned in the workshop, but many of the assumptions and much of the evidence for it was laid out and openly questioned. The breadth of the population with which

schools have to deal was raised as an issue to illustrate the complexity of the school's problems. Don't forget, said one participant, that besides education, the institution operates as an alternative to prisons, to employment, and to mental health treatment. Nor should we forget, said another participant, the number of actors influencing the child who are outside of school, much of the child's social behavior and social career developing in the family milieu.

Others laid emphasis on the lack of independence of teachers and school administrators. Teachers, it was held, had little freedom as individuals to choose what to teach or how to discipline. Another participant said this: that after the public discovers that the school has not accomplished what had been expected, the public should not blame it. The school is not the villain; it is not the bad guy. In fact the school administration and school administrators probably have the narrowest degree of freedom I have ever seen. Anyway, said someone else, there is no data which can show that it is "irrelevant" curriculum or irrelevant schooling which is causing kids to tune out or to drop out.

But besides not being blameable, many participants suggested that the school might have more salutary effects than is commonly believed. The fact is, said one scholar, that the school works. And from what I know about the children of the middle class, the school accomplishes exactly what it is supposed to do. One finds, said another scholar, that the experience of school often comes off better than one might expect. There are two reasons for this, the fact that it is a meeting place, a place for making

friends, and secondly, a place where one can sometimes meet nice adults on intimate terms, who happen to be teachers.

A third participant tried to summarize his feelings by saying that perhaps much of the public's dissatisfaction with the school stems from a sense of over-expectation of what it can accomplish. Maybe our goal should now be to try and scale-down our expectations for the school to a more reasonable task.

Points were raised with respect to specific suggestions for reform. About curriculum the following was said: (a) that it wasn't a cause of kids dropping out; (2) that almost all possible varieties of pedagogical style had now been tried and so breakthroughs should not be expected; and (3) that the key to curriculum effectiveness was not what was written, but how it was delivered. If, for example, a lesson on the American Revolution was delivered by someone who is mean, then the real message would not be about how our nation received freedom, but about how it personally feels to withstand tyranny.

About school functions, it was said that one always had to consider two kinds: manifest and latent. As one participant put it, I'm thinking for example of a school with its middle class origins but situated in a working class neighborhood. There is a symbolic role that school will play in the local community which kids will not be able to articulate but is real nonetheless. Regardless of how the administration lays out the professional ideology or the facts about the school which are kept to please accrediting agencies, the ethic of the school will always be separate and can be identified by the social scientist.

About schools and work experience--the following comment was made by one participant: many have suggested that we should somehow adapt the school to fit the labor market to the point of getting kids who "need" it, to have work experience. But there is a question of democratic values at stake here. In Germany, I lived under a system which used a simplified solution of sending kids who "needed" it, out to work at 13 or 14. It was a catastrophical class system.

A notion was advanced that in fact there were so many kinds of schools operating it was impossible to generalize about them, to say that the school experience is this, or that. But another notion was advanced that in fact there were common experiences in school, regardless of class level, racial background or what, and that which was common was the subjection of all individuals to two universal characteristics: (a) authority, and (b) work. At the end, what remained was to decide whether authority and work imposed by the institution were more useful in motivating students than were individual freedom and choice. This related to the political dilemma referred to in the previous session. But in sum, the thought was left that it wasn't entirely a genuine choice. It was suggested that the former, work and authority, were unavoidable characteristics of life and of institutions; and though not always pleasant, their existence in no way precluded an individual's success or happiness, and in no way justified calling schools to task for their lack of "influence" in a milieu of highly complex demands and a narrow range of choices.

SESSION III

Normal Adolescence

Question:

Recently it has been argued that while the incidence of problems such as abuse, juvenile delinquency or drug addition are alarming, still the vast majority of young people manage to pass through adolescence into adulthood without becoming one of these statistics. On the other hand, it is argued that there are additional issues (such as problems of anomie or self-concept) which are prevalent among all categories of youth. The question is this: from your experience, and from the experience of your research institute, how can one distinguish and define the problems which normally occur in adolescence from those which do not? Secondly, are there any of these normally occurring problems which might require governmental intervention?

To get a dozen scholars on adolescence around a table and then to ask them to define and discuss "normal" adolescence is like asking a convention of the National Organization of Women to describe the woman's normal role. Clearly it is something that each individual has thought about carefully, and it is not surprising that this session was fast and heated. There were tendencies for some individuals to discuss their own findings with respect to particular problems and target groups. And while some of these personal discoveries added to the discussion, others, though interesting, were peripheral, but besides these independent directions, there were common themes and exchanges which built upon the previous discussion. These exchanges elicited several startling insights. Often the discussion was conflictual and ultimately unsettled. But in at least as many cases, there was open concurrence, and considering the diversity of the scholars present, the incidence of this latter category may just well have set precedent for the field.

How Kids Learn Behavior

We will discuss the subjects of disagreement first. The first dealt with how children learn to do what is wrong. Since the cause of deviant behavior is a complex question, the lack of concurrence was not surprising. On the one hand, there were those who conceived of behavior as a function primarily of the wider environment. One participant began with an assertion that in certain circumstances what may be law-breaking (i.e., delinquent) may in fact not be criminal, and illustrated the influence of society in the following way: Our society is organized in such a way, that we flamboyantly display the things which are most pleasurable for adults (such as sex and alcohol), but demand that nonadults not participate.

Is it any wonder why the more precocious of the nonadults express their precocity by engaging early?

Many of course, agreed with this explanation. But not everyone. One who disagreed replied in this way: Kids don't shoot heroin because their mother takes aspirin, or because they see tranquilizers advertised on TV. It is not the flamboyant display of the forbidden which motivates deviant behavior. It is the family. When the family breaks down interpersonally, then everything else really comes away. More than anything else, normality is predicated on the relationship between the parents.

The Dividing Line Between Normal and Deviant Behavior

Then the discussion turned to the point at which normal "illegal" behavior becomes "deviant" behavior, whether it could be determined, or whether agreement could be reached on exactly where the dividing line lay. Normal adolescents, said one participant, should be defined as those who perform to the expectations that the community defines for adolescence. But what happens, said another participant, when the community makes a conscious and public decision not to enforce laws, such as marijuana laws? Don't the messages for what is expected get all mixed up? If laws are enforced selectively, or if one blames the community for acts that an individual should be responsible for, then who can be considered deviant?

To decide what is normal, said another participant, we could approach it in at least two ways. We could assume that personality is a function of the social structure, set it up as a dependent variable, and then attempt to predict or account for it; or we could approach the subject in a sort of ethnomethodological fashion, ask the man in the street what he thinks is normal, and then decide for ourselves on the basis of what he says.

In sum, there was no closure on how individuals learn deviant behavior, whether from TV, peer groups and from influences in the general society, or whether from a weakness of direction within the family. Nor was there agreement on how to distinguish deviant behavior from normal. For except at the extremes, all behavior is subject to popular norms, and norms differ among communities and in all communities norms change over time. The only general conclusion from these questions would be that the discussion deserved to be continued, for understanding the dividing line between "normal" and "deviant" is important.

Adolescence Development: A Process of Stages?

Another disagreement had to do with whether development of the adolescent personality could be defined in stages. One individual held that adolescence should be conceived as a process in which a youth passes through three stages: early adolescence--in which the most pressing confrontation is with the physical changes; middle adolescence--in which some psychological confrontation and later disengagement occurs with the parents; and late adolescence--in which the "who am I' and "what am I doing here" questions are raised. After this third phase, the individual then has the capacity for intimacy and after that, then re-engagement with parents. These stages hold true for non-college students, though its validity stems primarily from middle class populations.

But not all participants agreed. One responded this way: In reality life does not really progress in stages. This last stage for example, the "who am I" stage, clearly questions like that are not limited to youth. "Who am I," and "What am I doing here" are questions which people ask themselves throughout their lifetimes. Also, the notion of interdependence doesn't commence at adolescence, it begins at age zero. If

given a loom to operate, a child of three can work like an adult; a child of nine can earn money sufficient enough to support siblings, and in effect be a head of household. Furthermore, the ultimate "stage" doesn't have to come at the end of adolescence, for I have seen a child of 12 struggle with the question of intimacy.

There were other objections to this theory of growth stages which came, not directly, but as proposals of alternatives. One was the theory of competencies. What do we have, said one participant, that will distinguish a young child from an adolescent? According to stage theories, at the lower end would be puberty, but don't we all know teenagers who have not begun to menstruate at age 16? I think, the participants continued, the problem is for us to locate new indicators at a social psychological level rather than rest our case on whether sexual development has begun. Another commented this way: Let the government worry about definitions, for the government has to be concerned with policy. We in the research community should worry about "processes."

But this was not the last word. Wouldn't it be just as arbitrary, was one rejoinder, to differentiate by "processes"? Thus, the issue lay unsettled. Though agreement would be reached that, for example, not all 16 year olds were at the same level of development, no agreement was obtained as to whether a better criterion might be by "competency" or by "stage." Later we will raise this issue when we talk about policy in a later section entitled: "Final Notes: Conflicting Criteria for Defining Adulthood."

In marked contrast to the exchanges reported above was the consensus over three separate issues: (1) the distinction between the concept of "adolescence" and the concept of "youth," (2) the prevalance of popular "myths" about adolescence, and (3) what we know to be "normal problems."

Divergent Concepts: Youth and Adolescence

One participant began by asserting that though the terms of "youth" and "adolescence" were often used interchangeably, they should not be. The concept of adolescence, he said, has psychological and physiological origins, like the research on puberty or competencies; youth as a concept has more social and political connotations. When European social scientists speak of "youth" for example, they do not necessarily refer to teenagers, but to a social or political entity whose membership includes many who have long since passed adolescence. The age group which is now included under the heading of "youth" ranges between the ages of 10 and 30; the age group within the range of adolescence is far less broad.

Historically, "youth" originated with the development of industrialization, said one participant, and compared to the history of human life on earth, is very recent indeed. The size of the class of individuals called "youth" is directly and inversely proportional to their demand in the labor market: the more the demand, the less the number of youth; the more the demand, the less they can be spared, and the more pressure there is for them to enter economic roles identical with adults. Furthermore, said this same participant, it is not surprising to find that support for compulsory schooling and other rights and privileges rose in popularity at the same time as the demand for adolescent labor was diminishing.

Then came a particularly insightful observation. It is interesting, said this participant, that "youth" are not only a result of the industrial revolution, but in terms of size of group are mostly a product of the post-World War II generation, particularly within the U.S. Only since the war have significant proportions of the age cohort been able to attend post-secondary educational institutions. Furthermore, "youth" is considered a time in life when experimentation and exploration are high priorities. Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that with this first youth generation now well integrated into the highest reaches of our technocracy, the age range of "youth" keeps getting extended upward. Perhaps it will ultimately be defined as interminable. This upward extension of youth age range has had the effect of expanding the value of experimentation and exploration into higher and higher age and occupational ranges. But all of this is dependent upon a healthy economy. If there is ever another general depression, then those who are considered youth will become coterminal with those who are considered adolescents. Thus, said one individual, we don't simply observe youth as a category in the life cycle. We create it, just as we create many other social categories that we place ourselves in.

Popular Myths Concerning Adolescence

The second point of concurrence had an even more pronounced effect. The subject was adolescence "myths". Specifically, the central objection seemed to be over the popular myth that adolescence was a period of inevitable and special "storm and stress," or that youth were "alienated." To understand adolescence better, said one participant, we will have to explore all the stupid assumptions about it, especially those that say that it is the no-man's land between childhood and adulthood. This is

a horrible concept. Who is in no-man's land? There is something very specific about adolescence as part of the life cycle, to be sure. But when we look at what adolescents have in common, it isn't all storm and stress, it isn't all sterotype.

Another participant was even more poignant. We have, he said, on the one hand a basic contradiction between the literature on adolescence which would not support a universal storm and stress ideology, and the popular media and government agencies on the other. Perhaps we should turn the issue around and ask why it is that adults in the press and in the government are so eager to consume these kinds of messages. Is it because of an economic fear? Perhaps the hostility towards adolescents is a problem worth investigating in itself.

Nor, in a third participant's mind, was there much doubt about who to blame for the distortions of information. Much of the alienated youth image, she said, has been perpetrated by Federal funding policies. Social scientists have been funded to investigate problems in an attempt to deal with what was perceived as a crisis situation. So much of the funded research has focused on deviancy rather than normality. So to improve the quality of adolescence research, we should do two things: (1) try and determine that which encompasses normal adolescence, and (2) clean up our own house in terms of what we focus upon.

Problems in Adolescence Which are Normal

Lastly, there was a sense of agreement that every stage in the life cycle contained problems, problems which were not crises, but which occurred normally. Therefore, in no way did the normal problems call for public intervention. The question then was what were they.

There were several responses. One came out of a comparison between industrial and non-industrial societies. It was pointed out that in non-industrial societies, the notion of autonomy which today we think typifies "adulthood," was only possessed by those we would characterize as "elders," the very oldest, the very wisest, and the most notable. For other adults, it was normal to spend all the rest of the years in preparation for that autonomy, and while in preparation, having the kind of relationship to authority which we would today think characterizes adolescence. Thus the implication was that in other societies, being "in preparation" for autonomous decision-making occurs over most of one's lifetime. And therefore, to be in a state of preparation should hardly be looked upon as abnormal for our children, or to be considered a "problem" requiring intervention.

Other normal problems which were mentioned were the following: (1) prolonged financial dependence and a natural desire for some independence; (2) distance from a structure of power; (3) the process of moving out of the legal status presently occupied and into another.

As one participant put it: All of these are normal problems. This means that no matter what level of intervention is conceived they cannot be avoided. It is normal for nonadults to feel that they would like to end their financial dependence, that they would like to become decision-makers (especially over their own destiny), and also to feel unsettled during the process of becoming adults. But this is a normal part of growing up.

SESSION IV

The Relationship of the Adolescence Research Community to the Various Branches of Government

Question:

Legislation, research policy, and program directions with respect to young children are all heavily and consistently influenced by the research and development community. Is the same equally true with respect to adolescence? If not, what steps might you suggest as appropriate to amalgamate adolescence research concerns and to communicate them?

The Lack of Adolescence Research Representation

One thing became obvious to the participants right from the beginning in this session, and that was the lack of representation of the adolescence research community within government. It also quickly became obvious that this was due to one reason more than any other: the fact that there was no adolescence research community organized. Certainly there were organizations concerned with problems involving young people. But these lobbies rarely had an interest in promoting research beyond their particular problem. As one individual put it: When it comes to legislation in the area of youth, somehow normalcy or "the developmental view" really has no lobby at all. The delinquency people have a lobby. The runaway people have a lobby, the service people and the adolescent pregnancy people all have lobbies. But where is the lobby which would encourage the research and programs to bring about understanding of normal development? The central concern of these "problem lobbies," is, by definition, to solve a problem. But their particular problem, though serious, may in fact involve a very small portion of young people. By comparison, the processes of socializing the young, a problem which affects everyone, goes comparatively unattended and unrepresented.

The reason for the lack of adolescence research organization was also clear, and was clearly stated. Said one participant: I think it is worth laying on the table what we all know. As researchers we have backgrounds which place a premium on individual autonomy, skepticism, and entrepreneurship. I share these concerns and these values. At the same time, I think most of us are aware of the real problems which are associated with fragmentation, with maintaining diffuse interests. Perhaps the time is right for some concentrated activity which, if nothing else, would organize an on-going intellectual exchange focused around adolescence research.

Five other participants reiterated similar themes, and though each concluded that there should be some organization to adolescence research, they reached that conclusion from different routes. For this reason, it would be worth presenting a summary of their opinions. They were as follows:

1. I see a lot of sense in all the theories which have come up at this Workshop, but somehow we must begin to form policy. We need to bridge the methodologies of the social and behavioral sciences, and maybe together with the expertise of the clinician, we can begin.

2. I tell you, I think we have been on a very discouraging course. Children and youth, and youth especially, have had an awfully hard time in getting any kind of recognition in the Federal government. I would certainly like to see a structure developed which would react better to the needs around children and youth in a way that fits what I think are the research needs. But I do not see that coming from pressure within government; I can only see it occurring as a result of pressure from the outside.

3. Once there was a very strong unit in the Federal government called the Children's Bureau. It had the ear of the President which was very rare because few could get that close. At the time it was effective and it was a factor over the years for children. Now I wish we had units which were using the term youth or adolescence prominently because otherwise the focus will be on children and be interpreted as meaning young children.

4. The Federal government in both service and research efforts should continually scrutinize the rationale for lumping children and youth together to be sure it is not overdone or inappropriate.

5. Since youth is rarely a live category in university budgets, and youth research is a fragmented activity, I think we can all agree that we need some way to speak for a group with respect to youth research. This would be doing everyone a service, including the larger society. We should find some form, some organization to do this. Whether it is in or out of government, whether we have agreement on methodological issues (even disagreements can be productive), is really less important than having people in this field being able to keep each other aware of where the most substantive work is going.

Objections to an Adolescence Research Organization

To this subject of an adolescence research organization, two objections were raised: one was answered, one was not. The more controversial of the two (at least among those present) was the issue of whether or not adolescence deserved to be separated out from the study of early childhood, from middle age, or from growing old, in fact whether adolescence could be understood without also studying its relationship with all other phases of the "life-cycle." We should not consider adolescence as an age category separate from other age categories, said one participant; it only encourages unnecessary competition and artificial distinctions. Logically adolescence is only one stage in a life cycle of problems and policies, and research should be allocated in that context, with that understanding, i.e.: without competition between life cycle phases.

This view was answered by two individuals, one who pointed to the legitimacy of specialization; another who pointed out that there were differences between approaches to research policy, and approaches to program policy. Said the first: No one should lose sight of adolescence as it relates to other categories of the life span, but this should not

mean that one cannot take one part of the life span and be especially concerned with it. For instance, the senior citizen has recently been studied more and we have increased our knowledge and understanding from that special focus. The same is true for early childhood. It definitely is part of the life cycle but nevertheless, we have focused upon it because we wanted to understand it better. I think the study of adolescence is worthy of similarly concentrated attention.

The second participant phrased her comment in the following manner: Research, she said, can legitimately concentrate upon age categories, but similar specializations in programs is more difficult to justify. Adventure has been suggested as being beneficial for young people to have. But there is such a thing as adventure for old people or for families. Perhaps other groups deserve adventure or parks or whatever just as much as youths. Therefore, when making services available, we should perhaps structure it across other dimensions and so reduce the potential for alternative groups viewing themselves as neglected.

The second objection to an organization representing adolescence research was concerned not with the fact that it may be unnecessary, or too diffuse, or too redundant of similar activity, but that it didn't go far enough. As two participants contended, the main problem of achieving access to policy was the lack of respect attributed to all social science. Said one: Many decision-makers are not social scientists and cannot be expected to independently interpret for themselves all the varieties of information coming out of our work. If we had a consortium, like the one under discussion a moment ago, should one of its functions be to recommend relative research efforts? At the moment I don't believe that the research community heavily influences legislation, research policy, or

program direction. I question that. I think that the social scientist is usually discounted and that decisions usually are made on the basis of values.

Said another: One indication of how under-represented the adolescence research community is in public policy is to look at the make-up of the President's Science Advisory Committee. This committee is organized similarly to the Council on Economic Advisors, with a five-person council. The best reports indicate that these five individuals will include two physicists, a physical chemist, a mathematician, and probably a microbiologist, if that person is very micro. Now this has some very real import and perhaps we should be concerned not just with the under-representation of the adolescence research community, but with all social science.

In sum, the general feeling among the participants was that there was a role to be played by an adolescence research community, a "community" which, by all accounts, was presently unorganized. In part, the lack of impact on the part of adolescence researchers could be attributed to the lack of account given to the social sciences in general, to the tendency to form lobbies only around particular problems, and to the reward structure among researchers for independence of thought, and independence of stature. Nevertheless, it was agreed that somehow these obstacles ought to be overcome. We can learn two things from the group on aging, said one individual, for they have made great advances in demythologizing the press successfully, and in organizing themselves in other ways.

SESSION V

Summary Session: The Future Role of the Federal Government

If one were to bring farmers to Washington and ask them what the role of the Federal government should be with respect to farming, it would not be surprising to find the ones invested in soy beans asking for more assitance and support for their crop, the milk producers for their product, and the corn producers for theirs. One might expect all would want the government to do more for agriculture in general, but if possible, for their investment in particular.

This did not occur among adolescence researchers. Though we had expectations to the contrary, the participants did not in any single-minded way, call for support and recognition of their particular subject areas, nor did they, in blanket terms, call for more adolescence research activity. Among a few, in fact, there was some suspicion over the research role of the state (in the abstract), and no assumption that more youth activity sponsored by public institutions was therefore positive.

A healthy debate took place over what positive roles the federal government could play, and issues fell into two distinct categories. One category dealt with theoretical policy, called Youth Policy; a second dealt with practical reforms in the procedures for funding research, as well as the synthesis and dissemination of information.

Youth Policy

Bring up the subject of Youth Policy and citizens will often say government should do "A" or "B." Not so among this group. The first thought that came to mind were precedents in the abuse of power in socializing young people. Some expressed the sentiment that government should have no policy, or that it should have a diversity of policies, but not just one. If we

are to consider a national policy with respect to youth, said one scholar, then we should remember two things: that unlike the old Nazi idea, it should not be one movement, but secondly and in contrast, it should provide the wherewithal to encourage diversity. It is this diversity which is a touchstone of this country, and its excitement.

Perhaps the encouragement of diversity was what a second individual had in mind when he suggested that a successful Youth Policy should be broad enough for it to have an orientation, but not specific enough to carry it to port.

But even if a Youth Policy is not uniform, or oppressive, still there were equity considerations involved in treating adolescents differently than adults. Said one participant: There is no national adult policy, therefore any youth policy would only exacerbate differences between adult and nonadult populations. Treating nonadults differently, like the juvenile justice system, has both positive and negative implications. On the one hand, it can protect; on the other hand, it can expect behavior from one population which isn't expected from another. The question is whether youths should be under closer scrutiny than adults.

Three additional suggestions were made vis a vis a National Youth Policy, one had to do with age segregation, a second with normal urges, such as the search for adventure, a third with the need to improve the quality of debate on adolescence. We will summarize each in turn.

Taking reference from the Panel On Youth and other reports which conclude that today's adolescent is more segregated by age group, one participant suggested that this problem should be one addressed by a National Youth Policy.

He said it in this way: one problem which youth policy should consider should be that of segregation, not segregation in its traditional racial interpretation, but segregation in terms of many necessary experiences: segregation from the very old, or the very young; from the very sick; as well as from those of different cultures, values and statuses. One objective of a youth policy should be to encourage a diversity of experience and so break these enclaves of culture, age and class. The ultimate objective should be to facilitate development, not the remediation, of specific problems.

Another concern was that there be some way to deal with normal adolescence urges, such as the need to seek challenge and adventure. Said this participant: There are normal urges in all adolescents, for example, the urge for adventure. A national policy should encourage young people to seek adventure. It should encourage exchanges between populations of young people. If national policy simply means that we are supporting positively some of these urges instead of twisting youth behavior, then I am for national policy.

The issue of sponsoring access to adventure as part of a national policy drew the criticism referred to in reporting session IV, that while a policy to encourage specialization in research seemed altogether reasonable, a policy to encourage the specialization of services seemed far more difficult to justify. Furthermore, one individual went on to say that he didn't think we actually had enough knowledge to establish a national policy toward youth services, but that we did know enough to establish one toward youth research.

There was one last comment having to do with a national youth policy. Nevertheless, this last comment served to ameliorate the problems people had differentiating program policy and research policy and to summarize the general sentiment with respect to role of government. One role, said this participant, which the government should help to play, is to help improve the quality of public debate on adolescence. There is no other stage in the life cycle so much at the mercy of the mass media. It is very difficult to pick up a Sunday paper or magazine in any part of the country which doesn't have some kind of article that purveys a set of myths about adolescence, not the least of which is the "storm and stress" ideology, or the assumption of non-pluralism, non-diversity and great conformity. Somehow there has been a need for people to stereotype adolescence in terms of a very few, very narrow mythological categories and it seems to be that there are some educational tasks to be done here.

Specific Suggestions: Government Centers for Dissemination and Improving Funding Procedures

What the government could do to "improve the debate" was a subject for considerable discussion; Some suggested that there should be high quality centers for the dissemination of research and analysis, others suggested that the government should sponsor research workshops on particular issues, or that it regularly help publish a series of research syntheses. The discussion progressed in this way. One participant said the following: There are two things which bothered me with respect to the federal role, and I think other people are aware of them. One is the tremendous fragmentation and the tremendous gaps with reference to

those research products once they are sent back to government. The second is that there ought to be a special government institution or center for the collation and synthesis of research knowledge on adolescence. Perhaps this could join on a consortium basis with other centers in the private sector and get together on courses of action. I think a consortium at least could do something towards making the research enterprise itself more productive by exchanging information, exchanging faculty, and doing some mutual planning. That process in its own right would be sufficient to warrant the development of a consortium.

Another participant agreed. What we do need, she said, are a series of on-going research centers for keeping tabs on what is normal, like the social indicators put out by the National Center for Health Statistics, surveys which have well-chosen probability samples and a good source of research data.

A third participant suggested this: Perhaps government could serve the public interest by sponsoring a series of workshops for people who write about adolescence in the media, or for those who write legislation concerning adolescence. The task should be to rid legislation of mythology and to dedramatize, to deconflictualize people's understanding of the adolescence era.

But these centers, workshops and research syntheses suggested did not pass without reservation. Said one participant: The idea that there is a value-free synthesis of research is a myth. But some emphasis might be placed upon those studies in which the investigator's conclusions were opposite from his hypotheses. Syntheses might be made simultaneously by individuals of divergent views. There are ways to overcome the problems of bias.

And a second participant demurred in this way: A consortium is a nice idea, only if it is research-oriented and if the primary focus at this stage of the game is research. If it has anything to do with social/political things ... I say forget it. I know for example, that the American Society for Adolescent Psychiatry pulled out of the National Coordinating Council for Children and Youth because participation simply wasn't worth it. They just argued among themselves and there was just nothing concrete that came out of it.

There were also practical suggestions made which had to do with procedural matters such as the process of funding research. In any discussion of the relationship of the adolescence research community to the federal government, said one participant, the subject of government procedures must be raised. There are too many contracts and not enough grants; there is too little bidding which is genuinely competitive; too much wiring; and too fast due dates and hurried procedures to do an honest job.

The balance between contract and grant research arrangements was the stimulus for someone else's concern. Said this individual: I am disturbed by the fact that the grant system is under attack. More and more research is let out by means of contracts. This increasingly concentrates the decisions for both the direction and the administration of research into the hands of a smaller number of people. I think the adolescence research community should have more of a role in taking the responsibility for deciding what is most useful and relevant.

But the participants did not naively view the lack of competition or the lack of direction from the professional community as a problem solely made by poor administration in the Federal Agencies sponsoring research. As one participant put it: With respect to the lack of competition one source of the problem lies in Congress. Too often restrictions are put into research-authorizing legislation as to who can bid, what percentages must go to certain categories of institutions, or in what amount to certain geographical locations. In no way do all problems of getting poor research lie in Federal Agency research administration.

Responsibilities of the Research Community

More than we had expected, it must be said that these individuals, each with vested interests in government research activity, were fair about their own responsibilities to their colleagues, and to the wider public community. For example, one said that when justifying the need for research we scholars need to be clear about what we mean by the word "utility." Public support for research is clearly related to our being able to demonstrate that knowledge can be used to help people. This can range all the way from our understanding normal developmental processes and developing tolerance for understanding up to specific programmatic designs. I think no matter where we stand on the extent of utility that there is room for all of us to agree on this: that there should be some demonstrable outcome of our work that the public or government ought to be informed about.

"Research" has been abused so often and in so many ways, that it would seem easy to be antagonistic to expressions of optimism about its impact. Nevertheless, even among these veterans, there was optimism and this was an optimism worthy of our attention. Said one individual: There is one more myth that maybe we should not appreciate and that is the supposed lack of effect of research effort, or of meetings like this one. I have had a fascinating experience being able to follow the movement for the retarded citizen pretty much from the start. I have gone to these meetings and have seen people come away unhappy and dissatisfied thinking they really didn't get much done, and yet I have seen fantastic commitments being made and lives being greatly altered, as a result not only of what researchers have done, but also as a result of meetings like this. We worry that if we say something unoriginal we have failed; but redundancy itself is not necessarily bad. We worry that nothing gets disseminated; yet I can show you lives that have been changed that have come about as a result of ideas, methods, processes, and propositions that were found in a literature which supposedly nobody ever uses, or from studies that were supposedly gathering dust somewhere. It is said that individuals psychologically channel their behavior based upon their anticipations. Well, my anticipations have been altered here and I'm not sure whose idea I will steal and implement but I assure you, I have some skill in these matters and where I come from there will be some commitments of resources that might not otherwise have been made as a result of what I have heard.

Another participant expressed his feelings about the day-and-a-half Workshop, and concluded that it had been particularly meaningful. His evaluation was subjective to be sure, but one not isolated from what was felt by others. He said it this way: I am trying to sort out how I might comment on what has happended at this meeting. Before coming I knew that there would be a whole bunch of different people from different institutions and that we might have a chance to play tennis with a lot of different ideas and concepts. But that in itself is rather like Jello and hard to hang onto and I had no idea what might really come out of such a thing. Now at the end when I sit back and think about being here for a day and a half in terms of processes--where we went--I think I would conclude that maybe we did get some place. At least I know some names and faces that are similar to me in a lot of ways. You know we belong to 27 or 33 different organizations and are probably overcommitted as it is to meetings, etc. The idea of having another hurts. But even after knowing this, I agree, I think we should get it together.

Finally, one other individual summed up his feelings in this way: We can learn <u>one thing</u> from our experience here; one thing that can be said for our government is that it is one of the few in the world that arranges to organize the opposition!

ADOLESCENCE RESEARCH OPINION AND NATIONAL YOUTH POLICY: WHAT WE KNOW AND WHAT WE DON'T KNOW

This section heading is a misnomer, for it is often true that to confirm the fact that we do not know something is to state a new fact that we know. In our opinion, to find out, and to admit that there is something "we don't know" is just as important a goal as to find out and to reach agreement on what we do know. So we have no apologies for the subjects on which we have no agreement and the questions for which we have no answers.

With Respect to Rights and Privileges Vs. Obligations and Responsibilities

There was unanimity that healthy adolescence development should contain both elements, that these elements should be balanced, and that this balance was highly specific with respect to age, competence and community norms.

To be considered a community, whether it be family or nation, there have to be some basic, agreed-upon tenets. If there are none, then the community will cease to function as a community.

We do not know whether age or competence is the more accurate criterion for granting privileges or responsibilities. Nor do we know if competence is a function of getting older, or whether the community has to provide these experience before a competency can develop. For example, we do not yet know whether adults derive their sense of responsibility from having had the power to make decisions for themselves as youths, or whether adult responsibility results from watching responsible adults from within non-decision-making roles as youths. The difference is crucial, and the lack of consensus on this issue is one example of something we don't know becoming in itself, something we do.

This dilemma is not likely to be solved, for clearly there is no simple answer. Young people need to experience making decisions for themselves, but young people also need social constraints. What we do know is that they need both. What we don't know is in what balance, and for whom. These are questions which the research community can help elucidate by virtue of studying precedent, but questions which the community needs to decide by virtue of philosophy.

With Respect to Normal Adolescence

An understanding was reached that most adolescents develop in ways that are not deviant, however one defines the term deviant. Most adolescents reach adulthood without having entered the juvenile justice sytem, without having run-away from home, and without having psychological trauma sufficiently serious to be defined as "mentally at risk."

There was a unanimous concern for normal adolescents, who they are and how they develop. And there was a genuine feeling that as a topic, adolescence has been subjected to pronounced amounts of mythology, to misrepresentation and to social prejudice; that many of these myths look upon adolescence as a period of universal "storm, stress, and alienation;" and that the perpetration of these myths has been exacerbated by local and Federal government agencies.

Thus we know that despite current waves of fear, about drugs, violence, sex, non-employment, anomie or parental conflict, normal incidence is not as bad as what is feared. The need for an intelligent and balanced perspective was so pronounced on this particular issue, that we believe the subject deserves to be thought out clearly, and perhaps youth development strategies retooled accordingly.

However, to decide precisely what behavior is normal, and precisely what behavior is deviant is not easy, and the truth is that there is no simple formula for us to follow. Public opinion may differ from research opinion, and research opinion may differ from advocate opinion. The exact point at which a given act ceases to be within the range of normal and permissable, and at which it enters the deviant arena and therefore becomes unpermissable, is not a subject of consensus.

But from the discussion at this Workshop we do know this much, that there are certain problems of adolescence which are normal problems and which should not be considered deviant. For example, the problems of being "in preparation" for adulthood are normal. These can include financial dependence and distance from a structure of power. Furthermore, the value of knowing that these and other problems occur normally, precludes the need to eliminate them through intervention efforts, and saves those efforts for adolescence problems more amenable to amelioration.

With Respect to the Influence of the School

From these discussions it became evident that schools, as diverse as they may be, do expose young people to the norms of work and authority. These characteristics may be in quantities which are over-abundant, or insufficient, depending upon the example and upon one's personal credo. Furthermore, it is evident that schools serve both manifest and latent functions, but that for many populations and particularly middle class populations (regardless of ethnic background) the school performs surprisingly well. This opinion, it was felt, was much in contrast to popular ideology.

With Respect to Youth Policy and
the Role of the Federal Government

Individuals held strong views on these issues, but there were four areas of convergence: the need to understand adolescence better and therefore the need to both see it in relation to other stages of life but to also specialize attention on it; the prevalence of popular myths about adolescence which deserve to be exposed as such; the belief that diversity and pluralism are not only abundant, but laudable; and finally, that the most creative role that government can play is one of "facilitator" for intelligent debate. In fact, these areas of agreement were summarized by one of the participants. In part, she said this: that when it comes to ideas we will never know the final thing, but I think we have reached some consensus here about four issues, and they are these:

1. We all agree that adolescence is one part of a normal general life cycle process. But at the same time, there is nothing wrong with looking at parts of the life cycle.

2. We all agree that there are an enormous number of myths floating around about adolescence (for instance that the family is falling apart), that our job is to check into these myths, and if possible play a role in correcting them with the general public. I think that we had basic disagreements over approaches, but that is a secondary issue.

3. I think we all agree, and we all say "yes" to the fact that pluralism and diversity exist, and that it is "good," and in terms of policy, it ought to be encouraged.

4. I have learned a lot about the role of government here, the kind of things we sometimes forget. I don't ever want to see politics

laid on us and have a terrible fear of dictators. But here I am far more optimistic and excited, for I think we can agree about seeing the government's role as that of a facilitator. I think we are going to have to think about what that means. Perhaps it means to facilitate communications among government units; I never realized how many units are dealing with youth. I mean I knew about it, but it becomes intensified when you sit here. But the facilitator role, however interpreted, would be a positive one.

Final Notes

After thinking over the exchanges at this Youth Research Workshop we have three brief additional notes to present with respect to policy. One concerns how a community might decide who comes under a youth policy. The second suggests a modest reform to publicly supported research. The third advances two specific themes which should be included in a future research agenda.

1. Who Comes Under a Youth Policy: Conflicting Criteria for Defining Adulthood. Since the environment of each age group is different, some suggest that adolescent rights and obligations should be allocated on the basis of age categories, with each year implying an increment of some kind. On the other hand, age differences may be significant for one behavior or activity, and not another. Deciding which individual is more responsible is complex, the concept of responsibility ranging over the following: finances, information, judgment, and impulse control. So others suggest that we allocate rights and obligations not on the basis of age, but on the basis of competency at handling one of these responsibilities. Nevertheless, the depth to this complexity can be illustrated if we remind ourselves that there are many "adults" who are not responsible in any of these categories of competence.

But as one participant put it, a "competency" cannot be scientifically determined, almost any kind of job can be done in some other way, and competencies achieved by some other method. Policy requires a uniform criterion, fair to everybody, and not subject to vast ranges of interpretation. So in allocating responsibility, communities are faced with a dilemma; the definition and measurement of competencies is inadequate for their use in policy, but more uniform criteria, such as age, is inadequate in scientific terms.

In deciding for whom a policy should apply, perhaps we should revert to utilizing obvious demarkations, such as legal age parameters. For however inadequate other age categories may be for explaining the activities of a given individual, the fact is that all individuals live under the rule of law, and for example, those under a given age are not allowed to legally make certain decisions independent of adult sponsorship. So in the future, when gearing social policy to "dependent" children, legal age can be useful for defining what we mean by dependent, for it has behavioral implications which are, in point of fact, universal.

2. Proactive Research. Current publicly-sponsored research on adolescence contains inherent partialities resulting from its processes of sponsorship. Popular pressure builds up to "solve" whatever is currently perceived as a crisis; legislation is sponsored which mandates one or another branch of the administration to discover the problem's prevalance, causes, and solutions; and subsequently funds may or may not be allocated to it. Funding will frequently depend upon the perceived level of crisis, and

this can create pressure on the responsible research branch to magnify its prevalence. This process has occurred with respect to problems of runaways, drug use, adolescent pregnancies, school drop-outs and teenage unemployment independent from each other. From this process emerge three effects. First, the amount and nature of the research sponsored which is partial to deviant behavior. Second, this process hinders the search for common causes while it divides problems according to short-term pressure and administrative organization. Third, this style elicits duplication of effort, divides support (e.g.: drug use vs. runaway behavior as the most pressing problem), and therefore wastes resources.

Instead, consideration should be given to conducting research "proactively," rather than maintaining this traditional process of "reactive research." Proactive research might do things differently in two ways: it should attempt to systematically investigate the linkages among problem behaviors; and secondly, it should, at the same time, investigate the linkages among normal behaviors. A proactive approach would not ignore valid and significant differences in behavior (not all runaways are drug users or vice versa), and simplistically assume single causes for diverse phenomena. What proactive research would do, however, is to investigate whether common causes and common solutions do exist; it would spend a reasonable amount of energy investigating why and how young people are socialized into becoming healthy adults. Simply put, proactive research would attempt to understand the processes of adolescence, to help the socialization to adulthood however possible, but most importantly, to take steps ultimately to prevent problems over the next decade, which through traditional reactive research planning, wouldn't have been anticipated.

3. A Research Agenda for the Future

One purpose of this Workshop was to help generate a future direction for youth research. But several elements which were introduced at the Workshop should be mentioned by way of an introduction. First, a research agenda should never pursue an idea in which there is no genuine question. Admittedly, no research or researcher is separable from personal preconceptions and commitments. Nevertheless, a research agenda should not be organized around a theme to which all participants know the answer, nor should that theme contain the simple purpose of generating proof.

Second, a research agenda should be specific enough theoretically so that it has intellectual cohesiveness. But no theme should be so specific that it is destroyed by disputed elements, or so microscopic so as not to engage a wide variety of participants, i.e.: so as not to "carry it to port." For example, the change in the mean age of puberty should not be a theme for a research agenda on youth. That theme would fail, not for lack of a clear problem, but for the lack of genuine political participation.

Third, one of the functions of any government-sponsored research agenda should be to raise the quality of the public debate. This is not to imply that only through the government can discussion be intelligent. Clearly that is not the case. What this implies is that for the most part, the debates over important themes in youth research are diffuse, are spread throughout academic journals and conferences, widely separated by time and by the financial ability to travel.

This could be overcome by government. One function of any research agenda should be to sponsor public forums, or "science courts" for very specific issues in adolescence research. Through debate, where sides genuinely differ, a research agenda can come to some valid conclusions, and program policy benefit by recommendations which are carefully constructed.

Themes for a Research Agenda

From this Workshop, two themes seem to have emerged which meet the criteria for a viable research agenda; one has to do with rights and obligations, the second has to do with the notion of community. Both issues are real, and tap the commitments of a multitude of researchers, professionals, politicians, and the public. Both contain genuine questions and are not issues which need supporting evidence in order to justify a new idea for a program. Both contain elements which are debatable, which lend themselves to public attention, and which deserve to be elevated and facilitated by government.

1. Which Rights, Which Obligations, and When.

This theme is eternal, but the fact that it would be unreasonable to expect a simple answer does not in any way deny the need for answers to elements within it. Let us illustrate by giving two examples.

(a) We know for a fact that even in the most compromising of "inner-city" milieus, the majority of adolescents in school are not "terrorists". Furthermore, we also know that social disruptions in a classroom can come to be tolerated to such a point that those who wish to learn cannot. Whenever these two assumptions pertain, then the question to be raised by society is when and under what circumstances the minority should be confronted with their social obligations (even if it implies classroom exclusion), and when and under what circumstances the rights of the majority to learn should be protected.

(b) An adult woman now has the right of control over her own body, and pregnancies can be terminated under specified conditions. On the other hand, despite the general diffusion of control devices, the rate of adolescent pregnancies has increased dramatically. The question is this: does the teenage pregnant woman have the same rights as an adult pregnant woman? Whether the answer to

this is yes or no, there is a second question, does an adolescent have the right to family planning irrespective of parental opinion?

Under the broad theme of rights and obligations would fall many other issues discussed at this Workshop: how to define deviancy; whether to treat adolescence differently from youth; if it is more meaningful to allocate responsibility by virtue of having reached a "stage," by having demonstrated a particular competence, or by virtue of attaining a certain age. Within this discussion too lies the ultimate question to be faced: whether society should give kids power, or whether society should not give kids power, and under what circumstances; whether and under what circumstances society should provide kids with more privileges, and whether and under what circumstances society should make more demands upon them.

2. Notion of Community

Community is a much-used word. It has appeared in education ("Community-controlled"), in the planning of Model Cities (elected representatives of the "community"), and in criteria for public agencies serving status offenders ("community-based"). Nevertheless, though the use of the word has implied that these organizations contained basic agreed-upon tenets, those tenets have not always been clear, and on occasion did not exist.

We know that a sense of "community" does exist, but that it may not be geographical. Its most fundamental element is kinship. But there are also more aggregate elements to a successful sense of community. These might be represented by religious, ethnic or political identifications, and sometimes even by organizations to rid groups of particular problems (Alcoholics Anonymous, Weight Watchers, etc.). The common element is that successful individuals are transcended by a social more, and do not permit themselves to act as individuals in isolation from the expectations of those whom they respect. This is the notion of community. It has been found to be useful for understanding why

some children perform better in school, why some kids don't commit crimes, and why some families stay together. It touches much of the research on education, juvenile delinquency, occupational attainment, and youth participation. We think it is time to explore it, collate as much information as we can about it, and come to a better understanding of how it works in families and how it works in larger groups.

There may be other themes to be derived from other Workshops. But these two are not inconsiderable undertakings. They do not necessarily imply massive amounts of new research or program support. What they do imply is a new coordination of existing ideas and arguments. At the commencement of the Workshop we pointedly asked the participants what the role for the Federal government might be, other than to provide more monetary support. In short, this is their answer.

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF POINTS RAISED IN EACH SESSION

SESSION I

Rights and Privileges vs. Obligations and Responsibilities

- One cannot discuss one, without the other; they are equal, inseparable.

- But this balance is not always communicated, nor is it always accepted.

- In fact, in some cases the two do conflict.

- Youths should have the right to specify and to change their own roles.

- There has been an over-emphasis of due process and the status quo, and an under-emphasis of the pursuit of happiness (defined as everyone's right to full personality exposition). This pursuit should take place in both work and in social relationships.

- It is normal to expect adults to worry about their part of obligations and responsibilities; should we not expect youth to do likewise?

- By asking youth to decide things, are we not asking more of youth than they should be asked to do?

- We should not force youth into cementing work roles because our misguided notions about their "needs for decision-making;" we need to keep their options open.

- Everyone's conception of what a healthy young person should be is both a private and a socio-political statement.

- The question for our country is this: how far can we take individuality without also acknowledging social responsibility?

- Our goal should be to preserve the benefits of individuality without its attendant horror show.

- In discussing the subject of obligations and responsibilities we should omit several common myths. One is that Eastern (bloc) countries have more idealism. The west already has a unique ideological combination, for example, the constitution.

- The pursuit of happiness leads to a multitude of researchable questions, e.g.: informed consent--at what stage? Or how can learning theory contribute to cooperation without killing individuality?

- What does informed consent mean to someone who cannot learn math because a kid out in the hallway has a gun pointed at his head?

- Before anything else, we must reach agreement on some basic assumptions; this is what defines a community. Whatever we agree upon is something we all want, e.g.: Sparta agreed upon the importance of military training. From this basic agreement, this basic manifesto, will come research questions.

- All pursuit of happiness has two directions: instructional and hedonistic.

- Though the question given to us stated that equal rights have been extended to nonadults "without reason or logic" I do not believe this is so; there has been both reason and logic involved, and these have been spelled out in court decisions ranging from freedom of expression, to freedom of assembly and dress.

- Much of our moral dilemma stems from our developmental dilemma, for the development of competencies is not linear. And this is also true with the interaction of competencies.

- With respect to the pursuit of happiness, if the ideal does not equal the reality, then why seek the ideal?

- We should not discuss "the pursuit of happiness" as a state of having no problems, for happiness may lie in the pursuit itself.

- We should ask ourselves three questions:

  (1) What do we want our children to do?
  (2) What kinds of lives do we want our children to lead?
  (3) What contributions do we want our children to make to society?

- Does an increase in a child's competency lead to his or her taking on more responsibility, or does taking on more responsibility lead to more competency?

- Should we concentrate our efforts on the implications of recent legal decisions, or should we concentrate our efforts to precede them?

- To define the "status of children" is an easy task for the statistician, but that is an extremely shallow approach.

- To understand the ecology of youth, and adolescence research is to know the implications of interventions. For example, we know that the early Eisenhower-Benson-Nixon effort helped to get the sub-marginal farmer off the farm, but it also placed him in Detroit, in Bedford Stuyvesant and other places. Perhaps if we had done some ecological research on the effects of our farm policy on Detroit and NYC, the same decisions wouldn't have been made.

- If children are given rights, the context to which they are applicable needs to be specified.

- In defining the development of competencies we should not rely upon age grades, but upon the development of the ego.

- Is there such a thing as an independent "youth culture?" Whether one believes yes or no it is a suitable empirical avenue for research.

- In our discussion of roles should we rely upon "consumer" perspectives, or scientific perspectives; what if 88 percent of the parents believe that the appropriate role should be "x" but 88 percent of the experts believe the appropriate role should be "y?"

- One question with which we shall all eventually be confronted is this: should we motivate people (a) by the example of others, or (b) through social constraint?

- In a way, just as the fabled professor of entomology after his years of study might become enamored with his termites, so might an expert in youth research become an advocate.

- Agreement should not be necessary, for advances in knowledge come from a dialectic of opinion, and breakthroughs often result from dialectics.

- It might be helpful to us to look to the ecology of relationships between adult and adolescent. In other words, an adversary relationship might be normal, but it is also normal for youths to be on good terms with adults.

- With respect to the ecological view, when discussing developmental phenomena, we should always connect it to the social system, e.g.: responsibility should always be "anchored" to the family, or to the peer group.

- "Responsibility" is meeting the obligations of others.

- We should not exaggerate what "research" can accomplish. We should remember that research is a social construction of reality, and we should not talk about cathedrals when what we really have are quonset huts.

- Socialization for responsibility and competence could place the sponsor in a position of exacerbating conflict.

- "Competence" is the expectations which significant others hold for an individual at a given stage of development.

- All appropriate behavior is guided by its social and institutional context. For example, the expectations for different age grades differ radically from ethnic group to ethnic group.

SESSION 2

Normal Adolescence

- "Problems" are not always wrong; in fact, many are normal. So to say that adolescents have problems therefore does not mean that we should intervene.

- What we should ask is not what is true for each and every adolescent, but what is true in general.

- The terms youth and adolescence are often used interchangeably, but should not be. By definition, adolescence has physiological origins; youth as a concept has more social and political connotations. The age group now being lumped into "youth" frequently ranges between 10 to 30. The issue and problems are very different especially at the upper range.

- Let us not forget two things: (1) the whole social category of youth is an invention of post-industrial society. And secondly, in other societies the notion of autonomy which we today think of as characterizing the world of the "adult," was only possessed by those we might think of as being elders: the oldest, the wisest, and the most notable. For others, it was normal to spend a good many years in preparation, and while in preparation, having the kind of relationship to authority which we today would regard as adolescent.

- One very powerful issue in adolescence is the adolescent's eye view of the next stage.

- With respect to juvenile delinquency we know that the rates are increasing but we don't know if it is because our reporting is more detailed, whether it stems from a broader definition of delinquency, or what. We don't have the retrospective information that is necessary to carefully compare rates of incidence for the same offense within the same age group.

- We also know that the profiles of children who enter the juvenile justice system for the first time do not differ in any significant way from those of children who have never entered.

- The question of "labeling" as a causal factor may be relevant to behavior on some school ground in Cedar Rapids, but it's not when talking about armed robbery in Woodlawn.

- Is delinquency caused by exposure to the juvenile justice system, or are there kids who are heavily into real criminal behavior, not status offenses, not drugs, nor sex, but armed robbery and the rest.

- Some instances of delinquency under some circumstances might be normal.

- Those who view adolescence through stages believe that the period begins with the onset of puberty and passes through three categories: early adolescence--in which the most pressing confrontation is with the physical changes; middle adolescence--in which some psychological confrontation and later disengagement occurs with the parents; and late adolescence--in which the "who am I" and "what am I doing here" questions are raised. After this third phase, the individual then has the capacity for intimacy and after that, re-engagement.
This concept is true for more than college students, though its validity stems primarily from middle class populations. But there is no universal path, no one type of normal adolescence, even within the middle class.

- Historically the size of the youth class was directly and inversely proportional to their demand in the labor market; the more the demand, the less the number of "youth." Thus youth rights also grew in inverse proportion to labor market demand, the more demand, the less they could be spared and the more they were treated as adults, the less demand in the labor market the more support there was for compulsory schooling and other protections.

- It is interesting. Not only are youth a result of the industrial revolution, but in terms of size, very much a post-World War II product. Youth is a time when experimentation and exploration are considered a high priority. It is not surprising that with the first youth generation now well integrated into the highest reaches of our technocracy, the age range of "youth" keeps getting extended upward, perhaps ultimately defining that stage in life as interminable. This has the effect of expanding the premium being placed on experimentation and exploration in higher and higher age ranges.

- Thus we don't simply observe youth as a category in the life cycle. We create it, just as we create many other social categories that we place ourselves in.

- In reality, life does not progress in stages. This last "stage" of adolescence, the "who am I" stage, clearly questions like that are not solely a part of adolescence. "Who am I," and "What am I doing here" are questions which people ask themselves throughout their lifetimes. Also, the notion of interdependence begins at age zero, and if given a loom to operate a child of three can work like an adult, a child of nine can work sufficiently to support his siblings as a head of household. A child of 12 can struggle with the question of intimacy

- What do we have that will distinguish a child from an adolescent? At the lower end is puberty, but we all know teenagers who have not begun to menstruate at age 16. I think the problem for us is to locate new indicators at a social psychological level rather than rest our case on whether sexual development has begun.

- There are at least three categories of indicators from which we might choose, each with varying degrees of research closure and agreement. They are the following: (1) physiological changes, (2) socially defined demarcated age statuses, and (3) psychological operations such as the Piagetian notion of formal operations, and others.

- Administrators need to be concerned with policy. We in the research community should worry about "processes."

- But wouldn't it be just as compartmentalized (read arbitrary) to differentiate everything by "processes?"

- Could a publicly-funded research strategy be developed which would focus not upon problems, however categorized, but upon non-problems such as "what is normal?" and how could this strategy be justified?

- In deciding upon what is normal we could approach it in at least two ways. Either we could assume that personality is a function of the social structure, set up as our dependent variable, and attempt to predict or account for it; or we could approach the subject in a sort of ethnomethodological way, by asking the man in the street what he thinks is normal or abnormal, and decide for ourselves accordingly.

- What problems occur in youth which are natural and normal, and is there any way of distinguishing them from those which are abnormal?

- There are normal problems and they are these: (1) prolonged financial dependence and a natural desire for some independence; (2) distance from a structure of power; (3) the process of moving out of one legal status presently occupied, and into another status. The process itself is a problem. All of these are normal problems. This means that no matter what level of intervention is conceived they cannot be avoided entirely. Thus, it is normal for nonadults to feel that they would like to end their financial dependence, that they would like to become decision-makers (especially over their own destiny) and that they should feel unsettled during the process of becoming an adult.

- Sexual precocity, using drugs, getting drunk or engaging in some kind of legally determined delinquency may, from the social-psychological point of view be seen as exactly the same thing. Yet government is interested in differentiation and Congress might not know how to function if it couldn't set up these separate packages. But if you look at these problems empirically, you find that they co-vary. So you don't find people who are drug users but who are not engaged in something else, and therefore there are ecological links among these behaviors.

- There are theoretical origins of behavior which can offer insights by conceiving causes as homogeneous. For example there is Merton's theory of blocked opportunity as an explanation of alternative behavior

- Our society is organized in such a way that we flamboyantly display the things which are most pleasurable for adults (such as sex and alcohol), but demand that nonadults not participate. Is it any wonder why the more precocious of the nonadults express their precocity by engaging early?

- We need to confront the point at which behavioral problems reach a normative limit.

- When it comes to legislation in the area of youth, somehow normalcy or the developmental view really has no lobby at all. The delinquency people have a lobby. The runaway people have a lobby, the service people and the adolescent pregnancy people all have lobbies. But whether from a biological, psychoanalytic, sociological or anthropological view, where is the lobby which would engage the research and programs to bring about understanding of normal development?

- I see a lot of sense in all of the theories which have come up at this Workshop, but somehow we must get together and form some kind of consensus, strong enough to begin to form policy. We need to bridge the methodologies of the social and behavioral sciences, and maybe together with the expertise of the clinician we can begin.

- I think normal adolescents are those who perform to the expectations that the social system defines for adolescence.

- Kids who shoot heroin don't because their mother takes aspirin. In other words, it's not the flamboyant display of the forbidden which motivates deviant social behavior, it is the family. When the family breaks down, then everything else really comes away. In other words, more than anything else, normalcy is predicated by the relationship between the parents.

SESSION 3

Influence of the School

- After discovering that the school has not accomplished what we expected, we should not blame it. The school is not the villain, it is not the bad guy. In fact the school administration and school administrators probably have the narrowest degree of freedom I have ever seen.

- Often one finds that the experience in school comes off better than what one might expect. There are two reasons for this, the fact that it is a meeting place, a place for making friends, and secondly, a place where one can sometimes meet nice adults on intimate terms, who happen to be teachers.

- In the U.S. there are today so many kinds of schools that it is impossible to generalize, to speak of the school experience.

- In discussions of schools, we should not forget that besides education, the institution operates as an alternative to prison, to employment, and to mental health treatment.

- Public dissatisfaction with school stems from the public's over-expectation of what the school should accomplish.

- In any discussion about the school's influence one should not forget the breadth in the cast of actors influencing the child, with much about a child's social career explained by the family.

- Teachers have no freedom, whether to choose what they teach, or to choose how to discipline, or to choose their style of imparting information.

- There is no data which show that it is irrelevant curriculum or irrelevant schooling which causes kids to tune out and drop out.

- All youth must expect to be subjected to two universal characteristics of living: (a) authority and (b) work.

- Decades of educational research and experimentation have pretty well identified all varieties of pedagogical styles.

- Our goal should now be to try and limit the functions of schools to what we can reasonably expect them to accomplish.

- Perhaps schools should be used as an EPSDT mechanism.

- The key to understanding the effectiveness of a curriculum is to look, not at what is written, but to how it is delivered. If a lesson on The American Revolution is delivered by someone who is mean, the real message will not be about how our nation received freedom, but how it personally feels to withstand tyranny.

- The fact is that the school works and, from what I know about the children of the middle class, accomplishes exactly what it is supposed to do.

- The questions about schools overlap both manifest and latent functions. For example there is always a symbolic role that schools play in the local community which kids may not be able to articulate for you, but is real nevertheless. Regardless of how the administration can lay out professional ideologies or facts about the school which are kept for the accrediting agencies, the civic ethic of the school will always be separate and identifiable. But it is really for the social scientist to see this kind of drama played out.

- At what age and under what circumstances should a child construct his own curriculum?

- Schools are not training for the jobs which are available.

- We should not take the problems of fitting the school to the labor market to the point of exaggerating the need for work experience. There is a question of democratic values at stake here. In Germany I lived under a system which used a simplified solution of sending kids out to work at 13 or 14. It was a catastrophical class system.

SESSION 4

Adolescence Research Community and the Federal Government

- If we are to consider a national policy with respect to youth then we should remember two things: that unlike the good old Nazi idea, it should not be one movement, but secondly and in contrast, it should provide the wherewithal to encourage diversity. It is this diversity which is a touchstone of this country, and its excitement.

- There are normal urges in all adolescents, for example, the urge for adventure. A national policy should encourage young people to seek adventure. It should encourage exchanges between populations of young people. If national policy simply means that we are supporting positively some of these urges instead of twisting youth behavior, then I am for national policy.

- There is no national adult policy, therefore, any youth policy would only exacerbate the already recognizable differences between adult and nonadult populations. Treating nonadults differently, like the juvenile justice system, has both positive and negative implications. On the one hand, it can protect; on the other hand, it can expect behavior from one population which it doesn't expect from the other. One question which this involves is whether youths should be under closer scrutiny than adults?

- An ingredient for a successful youth policy would be that it should be broad enough for it to have an orientation, but not specific enough to carry it to port.

- In any discussion of the relationship of the adolescence research community to the Federal government, the subject of government procedures must be raised. There are too many contracts and not enough grants; there is too little bidding which is genuinely competitive; too much wiring; and too fast due dates and hurried procedures to do an honest job.

- With respect to wiring, one serious problem source is in Congress. Too often restrictions are put on legislation as to who can bid on the research, what percentages must go to certain categories of institutions, or what amount to certain geographical locations. Not all the problems of wiring lie in the administration of research.

- Adolescents need adventure to be sure, but not all adventure should be considered physical. There is a social psychological adventure. For example, there are numerous roles which the adult world can provide for young people and this is something that researchers from various disciplines can address very sensibly. I think research can make some very reasonable, fairly well-documented statements that for adolescents there are things the government can provide that will not be restrictive, that will not cut down on diversity but will perhaps address adolescent needs in a benign and humane and open way.

- One role which the government should help to play is, in general, to help improve the quality of public debate on adolescence. There is no other stage in the life cycle so much at the mercy of the mass media. It is very difficult to pick up a Sunday paper or magazine in any part of the country which doesn't have some kind of article that purveys a set of myths about adolescence, not the least of which is the "storm and stress" ideology, or the assumption of non-pluralism, non-diversity and great conformity. Somehow there has been a need for people to sterotype adolescence in terms of very few, very narrow mythological categories and it seems to me that there are some educational tasks to be done here.

- Perhaps government could serve the public interest by sponsoring a series of workshops for people who write about adolescence in the media, or for those who write legislation concerning adolescence. The task should be to rid legislation of mythology and to dedramatize, to deconflictualize people's understanding of the adolescence era.

- We have a basic contradiction between the literature on adolescence on the one hand which would not support a universal storm and stress ideology, and the popular media and government agencies on the other. Perhaps we should turn the issue around and ask why it is that adults in these institutions are so eager to consume these kinds of messages. Is it because of an economic fear? Perhaps the hostility towards adolescents is a problem worth investigating in itself.

- One problem which should be confronted as part of a national youth policy should be that of segregation, not segregation in its traditional racial interpretation, but segregation in terms of many necessary experiences: segregation from the very old, or the very young; from the very sick; as well as from those of different cultures, values and statuses. One objective of a youth policy might be to encourage a diversity of experience and so break these enclaves of culture, age and class. The ultimate objective should be to facilitate development, not the remediation, of specific problems.

- A distinction should be made between a national youth policy and a national policy toward youth research. I don't think we know enough to sponsor the former, but we do know enough and have some experience with the latter.

- I would far rather see us continue the way we presently approach subjects in legislation. We have national policies on health, on education, and national resources, and in this way, attention does not easily get divided into age categories which may be competing with one another.

- What we do need are a series of on-going research centers for keeping tabs on what is normal, like the social indicators put out by the National Center for Health Statistics, surveys which are well-chosen probability samples and a good source of research data.

- We can learn two things from the groups on aging, for they have demythologized the press successfully, and have been well organized with good advocacy groups.

- Much of the alienated youth image has been perpetrated by Federal funding policies for social scientists were funded for crisis adolescent problems rather than emphasizing normal youth in an attempt to deal with a crisis situation. So much of the funded research focused on deviancy rather than on normality. What happened is that the social scientist can internalize and incorporate the negative sterotypes into his own work. So to improve the quality of adolescence research, we should do two things: (1) try and determine that which facilitates normal adolescence, and (2) clean up our own house in terms of what we focus upon.

- I have five comments or suggestions. (1) The first would be to not consider adolescence as an age category separate from other age categories. It only encourages unnecessary competition with early childhood, middle years, or aging. Logically adolescence is one stage in a life cycle of problems and policies, and research should be allocated in that context and with that understanding. (2) Those who enact legislation affecting youth, even on the national level, have small staff with inadequate training. They should be bolstered. (3) One important role which government can serve would be to continue to assist in the synthesis of research. We have lots of knowledge, but it is fragmented and weak. No one has systematically put large amounts of funds into activities which would synthesize it and hopefully, encourage public support for future research. (4) There should be more sessions sponsored by the government and these should be oriented towards long workshops. (5) Interagency Panels, which help to coordinate ideas and information between diffuse government organizations, should be encouraged and strengthened.

- No one should lose sight of adolescence as it relates to other categories of the life span, but this should not preclude specialization, special emphasis. It should not mean that one cannot take one part of the life span and be especially concerned with it. For instance, the senior citizen has recently been more studied and we have gained from that special focus. The same is true of early childhood. It definitely is part of the life cycle but we have focused upon it because we wanted to understand it better. I think the study of adolescence is worthy of similarly concentrated attention.

- To understand adolescence better we will have to explore all the stupid assumptions which are made about it, saying that it is the "no-man's land" between childhood and adulthood. That is a terrible concept. Who is in no-man's land? There is something very specific about adolescence as part of the life cycle. When we look at adolescents there are qualities that they have in common, and it isn't all storm and stress, it isn't all stereotype.

- I am disturbed by the fact that the grant system is under attack. More and more research is let out by means of contracts. This increasingly concentrates the decisions for both the direction and the administration of research into the hands of a small number of people. I think the adolescence research community should have more of a role in taking the responsibility for deciding what is most useful and relevant.

- Research policy can concentrate upon age categories, but program policy is more difficult. There is such a thing as adventure for old people or families; perhaps they desire adventure or parks or whatever just as much as youths. Therefore, when making services available, we should perhaps structure it across other dimensions and so reduce the potential for alternative target groups viewing themselves as neglected.

- One indication of how under-represented the adolescence research community is in public policy is to look at the make-up of the President's Science Advisory Committee. This committee is organized similarly to the Council on Economic Advisors, with a five-person council. But the best reports indicate that these five individuals will include two physicists, a physical chemist, a mathematician, and probably a microbiologist, if that person is very micro. Now this has some very real import and perhaps we should be concerned not just with the under-representation of the adolescence research community, but with all social science.

- Magazines such as Time and Newsweek divide events into categories, such as the "Sexes," "Medicine," "Behavior," etc. When it comes to "Science," what it means is physical science.

- Despite the success of putting a man on the moon, there are more similarities between the social and physical sciences than there are differences. We have learned to treat the physical sciences as though they were so objective, but if one reads Einstein's essay one is struck by his stress on intuition, for little in science can be discovered without it. And even in the physical sciences, almost anything that was ever found was not found for eternity.

- Perhaps it would help if we could distinguish between the term "youth" and the term "adolescence." Adolescence has its origins and its links with puberty. On the other hand, if there were European social scientists present, it would be obvious that their conception of youth was that of a social/political entity, as an actor in the political process. In America , the ideology and government policy seems to be to look at adolescence as a transitional stage and to gear research so as to smooth its edges. This suggests that we can have an entree to the government if in some way our work becomes a myth in service of youth. But our work may involve those issues confronted by the larger society as well, and they may be social or political issues as well as clinical or developmental.

SESSION 5

Summary Session: The Future Role of the Federal Government

- One thing that can be said for our government is that it is one of the few in the world that arranges to organize its opposition.

- I do not see that a national approach toward youth policy should be any less important than a national policy toward youth research. But I do see one occurring before the other.

- Two things have bothered me with respect to the Federal role, and I think other people are aware of them. One is the tremendous fragmentation and the tremendous gaps with reference to those research products once they are sent back to government. The second is that there ought to be a special government institute or center for the collation and synthesis of research knowlege on adolescence. Perhaps this could be joined on a consortium basis with other centers in the private sector and get together on courses of action. I think a consortium at least could do something towards making the research enterprise itself more productive by exchanging information, exchanging faculty, and doing some mutual planning. That process in its own right would be sufficient to warrant the development of a consortium.

- A consortium is a nice idea only if it is research-oriented and if the primary focus at this stage of the game is research. If it has anything to do with social/political things ... I say forget it. I know for example, that the American Society for Adolescent Psychiatry pulled out of the National Coordinating Council for Children and Youth because participation simply wasn't worth it. They just argued among themselves and there was just nothing concrete that came out of it.

- I am trying to sort out how I might comment on what has happened at this meeting. Before coming I knew that there would be a whole bunch of different people from different institutions and that we might have a chance to play tennis with a lot of different ideas and concepts. But that in itself was rather like Jello and hard to hang onto and I had no idea what might really come out of such a thing. Now at the end when I sit back and think about being here for a day and a half in terms of processes, where we went, I think I would conclude that maybe we

did get some place. At least I know some names and faces that are similar to me in a lot of ways. You know we belong to 27 or 33 different organizations and are probably over committed as it is to meetings etc. The idea of having another hurts. But even after knowing this, I agree, I think we should get it together.

- When justifying the need for research we need to be clear about what we mean by the word "utility." Public support for research is clearly related to our being able to demonstrate that knowledge can be used to help people. This can range all the way from our understanding normal developmental processes and developing tolerance for understanding up to specific programmatic designs. I think no matter where we stand on the extent of utility that there is room for all of us to agree on this: that there should be some demonstrable outcome of our work that the public or government ought to be informed about.

- But many decision-makers are not social scientists and cannot be expected to independently interpret for themselves all the varieties of information outcomes from our work. If we had a consortium, like the one under discussion a moment ago, should one of its functions be to recommend relative research efforts. At the moment I don't believe (relative to the first sentence of our question here) that the research community heavily influences legislation, research policy, or program direction. I question that. I think that the social scientist is usually discounted and that usually decisions are made on the basis of values. Perhaps an organization such as a consortium could help the research community play a more significant role.

- The questions that we seem to be raising have to do with what is most valuable, and what is less valuable. And in the process of the last day and a half we seemed to have gone through two stages. First we smelled each other out. That, however, is inevitable; all groups have to do that first before they do anything else. Second, we got a feel for some people with whom we might be in real agreement, or those with whom we may be in disagreement and would like to continue. I don't think we have exchanged deep knowledge, but we have got a feel.

- When it comes to ideas we will never know the final thing, but I think we have reached some consensus here about four issues, and they are these.

  (1) We all agree that adolescence is one part of a normal general life-cycle process. But at the same time, there is nothing wrong with looking at parts of the life cycle.

  (2) We all agree that there are an enormous amount of myths floating around about adolescence (for instance that the family is falling apart), that our job is to check into these myths, and if possible play a role in correcting them with the general public. I think that we had basic disagreements over approaches, but that is a secondary issue.

  (3) I think we all agree, and we all say "yes" to the fact that pluralism and diversity exists, that it is "good," and in terms of policy, it ought to be encouraged.

  (4) I have learned an awful lot about the role of government, the kind of things we sometimes forget. I don't ever want to see politics laid on us and have a terrible fear of dictators. But here I am far more optimistic and excited, for I think we can agree about seeing the government's role as that of a facilitator. I think we are going to have to think about what that means. Perhaps it means to facilitate communications among government units; I never realized how many units are dealing with youth. I mean I knew about it, but it becomes intensified when you sit here. But the facilitator role, however, interpreted, would be a positive one.

- There is one more myth that maybe we should not appreciate and that is the supposed lack of effect of research effort, or of meetings like this one. I have had a fascinating experience in being able to follow the movement for the mentally retarded citizen pretty much from the start. I have gone to these meetings and have seen people go away unhappy and dissatisfied thinking they really didn't get much done, and yet I have seen fantastic commitments being made and lives being greatly altered as a result not only of what researchers have done, but also as a result of meetings like this. We worry that if we say something unoriginal we have failed; but redundancy itself is not necessarily bad. We worry that nothing gets disseminated; yet I can show you lives that have been changed, that have come about as a result of ideas, methods, processes, and propositions that were found in a literature which supposedly nobody ever uses, or from studies that were supposedly gathering dust somewhere. It is said that individuals psychologically channel their behavior based upon their anticipations.

Well my anticipations have been altered here and I'm not sure whose idea I will steal and implement but I assure you, I have some skill in these matters and where I come from there will be come commitments of resources that might not otherwise have been made as a result of what I have heard.

- Since youth is rarely a live category in university budgets, and youth research is a fragmented activity, I think we can all agree that we need some way to speak for a group with respect to youth research. This would be doing everyone a service, including the larger society. We should find some form, some organization to do this. Whether it is in or out of government, whether we have agreement on methodological issues (even disagreements can be productive), is really less important than having people in this field being able to keep each other aware of where the most substantive work is going.

- The ideas that there is a value--free synthesis of research is a myth. But some emphasis might be placed upon those studies in which the investigator's conclusions were opposite from his hypotheses. Syntheses might be made simultaneously by individuals of divergent views. There are ways to overcome the problems of bias.

- I think it is worth laying on the table what we all know. As researchers we have backgrounds which place a premium on individual autonomy, skepticism, and entrepreneurship. I share these concerns and these values. At the same time, I think most of us are aware of the real problems which are associated with fragmentation, with maintaining diffuse interests. Perhaps the time is right for some concentrated activity which, if nothing else, would organize an on-going intellectual exchange focused around adolescence research.

- I tell you, I think we have been on a very discouraging course. Children and youth, and youth especially, have had an awfully hard time in getting any kind of recognition in the Federal government. I would certainly like to see a structure developed which would react better to the needs around children and youth in a way that fits what I think are the research needs. But I do not see that coming from pressure within government: I can only see it occurring as a result of pressure from outside.

- One way of having the adolescence research community affect the national research policy would be to concentrate activity on the five or six key groups in Washington, and the ten or twelve individuals in those groups who are responsible for legislation. There are perhaps ten people on Congressional committees concerned with children and youth. They are willing to come to your meetings if you ask them and they will share information and truly learn from you.

- All organizations, including government institutes, have their ups and downs at one time or another, and individuals in government, whether up or down may not have had the chance to read your article. So when you feel you really have a breakthrough, when you think there is really an advancement in learning, contact people.

- Once there was a very strong unit in the Federal government called the Children's Bureau. It had the ear of the President which was very rare because few could get that close. At the time it was effective and it was a factor over the years for children. Now I wish we had units which were using the term youth or adolescence prominently because otherwise the focus will be on children and be interpreted as meaning young children.

- The Federal government in both services and research efforts should continually scrutinize the rationale for lumping children and youth together to be sure it is not overdone or inappropriate.

- There has been much criticism of evaluation research. But though the specific research which is done on a given project may be poor from the standpoint of research, it may be helpful from the standpoint of research education for those who participate, for they will learn something from the process itself.